

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

"HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS, ARE THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."—Isa. lii, 7.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT NO. 65 1-2 BOWERY, BY P. PRICE, AT \$2 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE.

VOL. I.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1832.

NO. 49.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER. THE FEAR OF GOD.

A SHORT SERMON.

"But I say unto you, Fear not."

I will state a position of immense importance to mankind; the neglect of the discrimination of which, is not only the cause of a gross error, but also of much suffering. It is this—Truth is presented to the *understanding*; to the mental man. Error, or falsehood, to the *passions*; to the animal. Fear, in the common acceptance of the term, which is nothing more nor less than alarm, and apprehension of evil, and, in its maximum, a dread, and horror of suffering, is necessarily confined to the passions of the subject of it; for the obvious, but conclusive reason, that under such circumstances the recipient is incapable of reasoning; and his understanding, during the excitement, is abandoned, or prostrate. It has been said of the wicked, of those who depart from God, that "they shall fear, where no fear is." A strong, or hyperbolical expression, which signifies that those who have no confidence in God, and consequently are a prey to their own evil imaginations, shall be afraid when there is no cause of fear. For "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." Fear destroys peace. It is impossible for a man's passions to be excited by dread and apprehension, and, at the same time to enjoy or, be at peace; as much so, as for the ocean to exhibit all the turbulence of a tempest, during a calm. Confidence in God is the foundation, and the only foundation of peace to the mind of man. 'Tis folly to deny this position; and the experience of the man who shall deny it, will give him the lie direct. And the converse of this proposition is equally true. In an exact ratio with a man's want of confidence in his Maker and Judge, will be his horror and apprehension in the hour of peril.

My positions can be illustrated by the following considerations: No man has *two sets of faculties*, one set for estimating and determining worldly matters or concerns; and another for the exclusive use of judging and considering religion, or the concerns of another world. I will venture to presume that no man in the possession of his five senses, and the use of them, will deny the truth of this proposition. Therefore it follows, that as a man is rendered absolutely incapable of judging, determining, and acting, in the business of this world, while his mind is distracted by fear and apprehension, he is equally, and to the same extent, to all purposes, as much incapacitated, while distracted by fear and apprehension, to attend to the concerns of another world. Therefore, that doctrine, or those means, which operate to generate fear, apprehension, dread, and horror, will enable a man to be at peace with his God, just as certainly as any thing which will distract a man with fear, dread, apprehension, and horror, will enable him to attend to his worldly business, and bestow on him valuable facilities for judging of his affairs, and arranging with prudence and circumspection whatever appertains to his avocations or profession. I conclude, therefore, that fear, as I have considered, defined, and described it, so far from being a necessary ingredient in, or constituting a part of, religion, is absolutely incompatible with religion itself, and an obstacle in the way of acquiring it. To prove

that I am correct in my positions I appeal to the fear, dread, apprehension, and horror of all mankind, and I am confident I shall have a great majority of witnesses in my favor.

I shall assume the position that I have correctly defined the term *fear* and that no other signification will stand the test of the world's experience; which is the only evidence which can be offered as positive, and irrefragable, in opposition to conjectures, and theory. An apostle has said, that "fear hath torment." And when Christ says, "Fear not," he says, in other words, be not tormented. If I am correct, and I believe my positions cannot be controverted, the logical conclusion which is supported by reason and philosophy, as well as by the Scriptures, is this, that it is folly to indulge and give place to fear, because fear will torment the recipient, and answer no good purpose whatever. I therefore say unto you, Reader, "*Fear not.*" Fear is the most unprofitable thing in existence. The Christian, in the triumph of his faith and confidence in God, his heavenly Father, asks, "The Lord is my light and my salvation, who shall I fear?" Surely, not the Lord. What! Shall a man be afraid of light, and salvation? "The Lord is the strength of my heart, of whom shall I be afraid?" Shall a man fear that Omnipotent strength will fail?

We have evidence, that before the death and resurrection of Christ our Lord, his disciples feared men. The context to our text informs us, that Jesus, who knew their imperfection, rebuked them, and told them, in import, not to fear them whose utmost malevolence could only destroy the body; and signified to them, that if they feared at all, it would be more reasonable if they should fear a Being who possessed greater power than man; but, and it will sound strange to some ears, concluded his exhortation to them, by saying, "*Fear not.*" The conclusion is both logical and irresistible, that there is no cause of fear. When Christ told his disciples to "consider the lilies of the field, how they grow," &c. and asked them, "if God shall clothe the grass of the field," &c. whether he would not clothe them?" and rebuked them for their want of faith, he enforced and illustrated the beautiful and sublime truth he taught, by the interrogation, "Is not the life more than meat? and the body than raiment?" As if he had said, Shall God withhold the lesser, and give the greater? Is it reasonable to suppose, that God, a wise, and good Being, would give life, without giving food to sustain it? Or a body, and not raiment to protect it? No, it is not reasonable. And in the case in question, Christ calls upon his disciples to behold the sparrow, which is among the most insignificant of the feathered race, and informs them that God takes cognizance even of the fall of a sparrow. Reader, what conclusion would a mind uncontaminated with the dogmas of men, draw from these facts? Would it not be this, that if God's providence extended even to the fall of a little sparrow, that man, who is of more value in God's scale of creation than many sparrows, would be regarded by his Maker accordingly? Well, this is the very conclusion which Christ deduced from his own premises; and he declared to his disciples this obvious truth, that they were of more value than many sparrows, and therefore he said unto them, "*Fear not.*"

It is a remarkable fact, that one of the most distinguished disciples of Christ has not only classed *fear* among, but placed it at the head of, the list of vices or sins, which operate to exclude the recipient from God's kingdom. In the Book of Revelation it is declared, that "the *fearful*, and the abominable," &c. shall be excluded, etc. Surely it would be madness to class with the Christian virtues a passion which is placed at the head of the list of abominations, and the possession and exercise of which will exclude the offending party from God's kingdom!

But notwithstanding, it is *safest* and best, says the prudent, careful, and timidly cautious would-be christian, to *fear a little*. It won't do to be too confident—we may be mistaken at last—God may not be so good as you suppose—it won't do to be too certain—it is better to doubt a little. This word *little* has no place in the vocabulary of Christ's disciples. If a thing is good, a little of it is not enough. If it is bad, a little is too much. There is no virtue which appertains to the Christian's character, no item of duty, or quality of principle, or motive of action, that can be graduated on this *little* scale of fearful caution. No. The language of God is, "Give me thy heart. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, mind, soul, and strength."

Reader, do you fear a little? Then you will be tormented a little. Do you doubt a little? Then you will be damned a little. In an exact ratio with your fear, doubt, and uncertainty will be your torment. "Fear shall come upon you as desolation." The man deceives himself who thinks he can fear a little, and doubt a little. There is no such thing as a little fear, and a little doubt. It is *great*, not little. A man either believes God's promises, or he is an unbeliever of them. A man is either *dead* in trespasses and sins, or he is alive by the faith of the Son of God. Reader, mark well the distinction. The faith of the Son of God. Will any man professing a knowledge of the Gospel of Christ, venture the declaration that Jesus Christ feared a little, and doubted a little? That the man Christ Jesus harbored, and cherished uncertainty in his mind, relative to his Heavenly Father's purposes and intentions? No man can be guilty of so great an absurdity. Christ's faith was all love, hope, expectation, joy, and confidence. It is the peculiar, distinguishing, and infallible criterion of the faith of the Christian, that it *advances* from faith to faith; up, up, until faith is swallowed up in sight; in the fruition of God's presence; where there are rivers of joy, and pleasures for evermore.

Do we not read that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom?" Yes. But we do not read that the *fear* of the Lord is wisdom, but only the *beginning* of it; and it is added, "A good understanding have all they that keep thy commandments." Now the man whose understanding is so good as to keep God's commandments, is too wise to fear. Do we not read that "God has pleasure in those that fear him?" Yes. But it is added, "in them that hope in his mercy." These qualifications illustrate our subject. God has pleasure in those who fear him to that degree that they *have hope* in His mercy. But the subject of modern revivals, who regards his God and Savior with apprehension, dread, and horror, and doubts God's mercy, is not plea-

ing to God. The language of faith is this—"The Lord is my portion, saith my soul, therefore will I hope in Him." On a certain occasion the disciples of Christ were afraid—they doubted. Christ's language to them was, "O ye of little faith." Reader, they believed a *little*! but they feared and doubted a great deal. Do we not read "that as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him?" Yes. But how does a *father* pity his children? Why is pity exercised at all? The answer is obvious. No father feels pity for his children when they do not by their peculiar condition become objects of pity. The man who has so far mistaken the character and purposes of God, as to regard Him with apprehension, dread, and horror, instead of love, confidence, and joy, is an object of pity above all others; and a God of love and mercy will pity him as a good father will pity his children when they are the subjects of pain and affliction.

I will caution my readers not to confound *fear* with *humility*. We read, "To this man will I look, even to him who is poor, and of a contrite spirit, and who trembles at my word." A man may be alarmed, and filled with dread and horror, and at the same time possess not an iota of humility. The difference between the dejection and depression of fear, or apprehension of suffering, and self-abasement, or abhorrence on account of unworthiness, may challenge a competition with all created intelligences, and nothing can be imagined which will show a stronger contrast. In the one case, we behold the trembling slave, regarding his Master with fear and horror. In the other, is exhibited a child, sorrowing on account of conscious unworthiness, and disobedience to the Greatest, the Wisest, and the most affectionate of Fathers. No man can be too humble. But any man can be too great a coward. The horrible, impious, and inconsistent speeches y'clep'd prayers, of some people, are sufficient evidence of the prevalence of religious cowardice, and its concomitants, presumption, and affectation. The meek and lowly Jesus says, when ye pray, say, "Our Father," &c. It has been left to modern times to produce a race of christians, who, disregarding the advice and exhortations of the Sent of God, venture to insult the King of Heaven by their modernized prayers, scholastic petitions, and dogmatical and bombastic addresses. The abject meanness and cowardice of the slave, has superseded the humility of the Christian—pride, supercilious arrogance, and bigotry has usurped the place of religion—and the Gospel of God our Savior has been laid aside to make room for the dogmas of human zealots. Heaven be praised that there are some of every sect who have not bowed the knee to the modern Baal, and voluntarily offered indignity to the God of Heaven! Reader, remember the declaration of Jesus—"They that worship the Father, must worship Him in spirit, and in truth." Reader, The Father! Are you a *father*? "If you," Reader, "being evil, know how to give good things to your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give good things to them that ask Him!" Let the *slave* deprecate the vengeance of the *tyrant*. But *children* should approach their *Father* with reverence and joy.

We have seen that fear defined according to the common acceptation of the term, which is unquestionably the true one, consists in the apprehension and dread of suffering. That humility consists in self-abasement, or abhorrence, the consequence of a conviction of unworthiness; and that they have no more affinity or relation than the antipodes. There are men, no doubt, whose senses, feelings, and conceptions, are, for the time being, completely engrossed and confined to the pursuits of business or pleasure, and the general objects appertaining to the present state of existence. This con-

dition, however, is only temporary, and is interrupted by various events which happen in God's providence. This class of men may be said to live "without God in the world;" and they are those, who by their conduct say to their Maker, that they desire no knowledge of His ways. This class of persons are foolish—they are in the path of folly. To such, the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. For a dread and apprehension of God, is the first step they take in the progress of acknowledging His being and sovereignty. And this, which to such characters may be considered, contrasted with their former thoughtless and foolish conduct, as a *beginning* of wisdom; would, to the humble and confident believer in God, as he is manifested in Jesus Christ, be a departure from the wisdom which had previously characterized his faith and practice. Nothing, therefore, can be more obvious than the difference which exists between the fear of God which is experienced by the humble and confiding believer, and the alarmed, proud, and doubting unbeliever.

Our subject can be illustrated by a consideration of the different effects which are produced by the two kinds of fear which I have described. In the one case, the fear produces a dread, and apprehension of suffering, amounting to absolute horror. In the other, to a godly sorrow, and self-abhorrence, and renewed devotion, and increased confidence in God's mercy and goodness. In the one case, the fear may deter the party from the repetition of the commission of sins, from a dread of consequences, or apprehension of punishment and suffering; in the other, it proves a stimulation to virtue and obedience, from a deep sense of obligation to that Great and Good Being, whose promises can never fail, and whose plenteous redemption and boundless mercy and kindness, are a sufficient guaranty of safety and happiness. In the one case, the criminal trembles in dread of punishment—in the other, gratitude and love are the prevailing sentiments. These cases are strongly marked, and truth and experience will attest their verity.

It must occur to the intelligent and candid Reader, that all fear which is accompanied with a doubt of God's mercy and forgiveness, is an absolute sin; for the reason that it is incompatible with *faith* in God's promises, without which it is impossible to please God. For, although God has pleasure in those that fear him, it is those, and those only, whose fear is compatible with *hope in His mercy*. How then can a dread and apprehension of treatment from God, which amounts to a palpable contradiction of His promises, purposes, and designs, be accounted as a Christian virtue, without involving an impious absurdity? Can we suppose that the Majesty of Heaven and earth, the only Potentate and Sovereign of the Universe, will be less jealous of His praise, than poor, weak, imbecile, and impotent man! Is it considered honorable among men, to doubt the fulfilment of their promises, and to question their veracity? Will a man feel himself praised when his word is questioned, and the performance of his promises considered as uncertain? How then can the great God, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, be supposed to regard that man with complacency, who, notwithstanding the oath and promises of JEHOVAH, remains in unbelief, to that degree, that he is filled with doubt of His veracity, and apprehension of His wrath. Well has Inspiration declared, "It is *your sins* that have separated you from your God."

The first account of fear on record, will throw light on our subject. Adam and Eve, the first sinners, when they had committed the first sin, were afraid, and hid themselves. They were anxious to screen themselves from the consequences of their wrong doing. The cruel and unfeeling brethren of Joseph, when they recog-

nized in the governor of Egypt their injured brother, were afraid. Every sinner, when evidences are first presented to his mind, and force a conviction of the truth of the existence of a God, who will punish transgressors, is horribly afraid. Fear, therefore, in the true acceptation of the term, is the first exercise or action of the human mind, when death, judgment, and eternity, are presented to view, and the Great Sovereign of the Universe contemplated, as He is seen through the distorted medium of dread and apprehension. Reader, this is the fear of God, when regarded as our enemy, or an inexorable judge. But the humble believer in God and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent, how does he fear God? The answer is obvious—The humble believer fears God as a *child fears a father*. His fear consists of reverence, veneration, humility, submission, a consciousness of entire dependence, a feeling of self abhorrence and unworthiness, a strong desire to increase in every good principle, word and work, a willing acquiescence in God's providence, accompanied by a joyful confidence in His mercy and plenteous redemption. This fear is compatible with confidence and peace. Amen. H. F.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER. DISCIPLINARY PUNISHMENT.

Praying for corrective punishments consistent with the benevolent spirit of the Gospel.

Let all their wickedness come before thee; and do unto them as thou hast done unto me for all my transgressions. Sam. i. 22.

These words are couched in the form of a prayer, and appear evidently to be the breathings of the soul poured forth in devout supplication to the throne of Heaven. The superficial observer might be led to apprehend, that this expression exhibits a strange perversity of mind, destitute of humanity and natural sympathy; or a heart deeply imbued with malignity and revenge. But as this sentiment was recorded, when the inspired penman was bowed down with a load of afflictions and grievous burthens, which he regarded as the chastisements of God for multiplied offences—when the penitential tears gushed profusely from his eyes, and in copious streams stole down his wo-worn cheeks—when the righteous judgments of God were frankly acknowledged, and a submission to his holy mandate was most cheerfully tendered, we should naturally conclude that malevolence would be excluded from his bosom, and that the spirit of the expression would be found to harmonize with the heavenly and benign principles of benevolence and moral goodness; and to coincide in character with the motives, feelings, and desires of the pure in heart. And I apprehend that a little attention to the subject will render it obvious, that this form of petition is in perfect concord with the holy aspiration of the benevolent soul; and in no way repugnant to the pure, philanthropic, and sublime principles of the Gospel.

It is not the purpose of this communication to give a dissertation on the nature, object, and utility of prayer; but rather to demonstrate, by proper and just reasonings, that the expression standing at the head of this article, is in perfect agreement with the principles of christian perfection.

Let us then consider the nature of the Prophet's petition, "Let all their wickedness come before thee; and do unto them as thou hast done unto me for all my transgressions." The first thought which suggests itself to the understanding is, what is the moral turpitude of sin?—what punishment does it deserve? If it be answered, sin is an infinite offence, and deserves endless punishment, then who could pray that all the wickedness of the transgressor might come before the Lord for judgment and a righteous retribution, even were he the bitterest and most inveterate enemy? Let those who main-

tain that the punishment of God is vindicatory and not disciplinary and emendatory, reflect on this subject, and pray thus, if they can. The very thought of thus supplicating heaven would congeal the crimson fluid flowing in the veins of a Nero or a Caligula, and cause the merciless Inquisitor, who relentlessly tortures his hapless victim on the rack, the gibbet, or the auto-da-fe, to shudder with horror and dismay. Nay, if peradventure by any perversity of mind, an individual should coolly and dispassionately make such a vengeful request, the barbarous savage, who exults in demoniac yells at the writhing agonies of the helpless sufferer he consumes at the stake, would blush and hang his head for shame, to think himself a man. It is not uncommon for those who have named the name of Christ to pray devoutly and fervently for the salvation and ultimate holiness and happiness of the whole human race. Indeed, providing they have assimilated to his likeness—drank into his spirit, and as “elect of God, put on bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering, so as to exercise forbearance, and forgive one another,” how is it possible they should pray otherwise! If any man in sincerity takes up the cross of his Divine Master, and follows his Redeemer, he can but love *all*, and bless *all*, and pray for *all*. For those who are born of God will become imitators of Him as dear children! And “love is of God, and every one that loveth, is born of God, and knoweth God.” He that loveth not, knoweth not God, for God is love. And if any man say I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: For he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen? Thus it is absolutely impossible for an individual under the holy influences of the Gospel or direction of the spirit of God, to pray for the hopeless perdition of a single son or daughter of Adam. For they unitedly teach us to love our enemies and to do by others as we would have others do by us. And to desire their hopeless wretchedness would be loving them with a vengeance. Hence, if interminable pain proves to be the doom of any one, no holy being could ever pray for it in sincerity, but for the contrary. Therefore, those that believe this sentiment, always desire it may prove false, which clearly evinces they are unreconciled to the supposed will and providence of God. And in fact it would be but solemn insult to the best feelings and noblest impulses of the human heart, to require the soul to bow in acquiescence to such a horrible catastrophe.

Men, for the most part, pray for the dispensation of mercies and favors, and for an escape from all judgments and calamities. Nay, for the remission of all the punishment due their transgressions. But is this right? is it consistent? “Have we received good at the hand of the Lord, and shall we not also receive evil?” How vain and presumptuous—how idle and foolish to pray for that we know cannot, consistently with the principles of the divine administration, be given us!! If we would have our prayers acceptable, and answered with messages of peace, we must pray in faith, and in accordance with the sovereign will of Heaven. I know it is impossible for us, when influenced by right feelings and proper motives, to petition Heaven for ought, but what in our apprehension, shall either tend to our benefit, or the benefit of others: “For love worketh no ill to its neighbor,” yet as the man uninstructed in the ways and purposes of Jehovah, is ignorant of his best good and true interests, he knows not how to pray as he ought, and he stands in need of the communications of the Holy Spirit (by which we are to understand the revelation of God,) to help his infirmities, and enable him to offer up his supplications in conformity to the *will*, and moral government of Jehovah. Vain is the thought of changing the disposition or counsel of the Al-

mighty. And whoever has just views of his character, and proper conceptions of his Divinity, will perceive the hand of benevolence in all the dispensations of his wise economy, and in every department of his well-administered government. And hence, under the apprehension that every thing tends to the production of harmony, perfectability, and happiness, he will feel disposed in humble submission to the will of the Supreme, to desire God’s counsel to stand, and Him to do all his pleasure.

If, under the guidance of heavenly love, we could but pray for that only, which, in our imagination would serve to happy mankind, then, as the happiness of the human species depends on a certain temperament of mind, modes of thinking, and habits of acting, so in praying for the felicity of the world, we should reasonably desire the existence of the prerequisite means to accomplish the end desired. Therefore, if under certain circumstances, afflictions and chastisements are necessary to secure proper dispositions of mind, and rectitude of conduct, we could not, with any degree of propriety, beg Jehovah to withhold them, and to continue the lavishing dispensations of his mercies, that the soul might riot on the indulgencies of Heaven. Requests to the prodigal are not always blessings. We might desire the cup should pass, providing the ends could be as wisely secured by some other more agreeable process, but it should be with the understanding, that “not my will, but thine O God be done.”

There are numerous instances on record, both in sacred and profane History, where afflictions and chastisements have served to reclaim the wanderer, and bring him back to his father and his God. Indeed, our almost every day’s experience and observation bear record that the tendency of punishment is to correct the sinful offender, and make his cheerful feet, in swift obedience, move. David says, “before I was afflicted, I went astray, but now have I kept thy word. It is good for me that I have been afflicted. The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether—more to be desired are they than gold, yea than much fine gold; sweeter also than the honey and the honey comb. Moreover, by them is thy servant warned, and in keeping of them, there is great reward.” And concerning the adulterous and stiff-necked Jews, and God’s dealing with them, he says, “When he slew them, then they sought him and returned and inquired early after God. And they remembered that God was their rock, and the high God their Redeemer.” Nebuchadnezzar, Prince of Babylon, was exalted to the highest seat of grandeur, opulence, and kingly power. Nations obeyed his summons, and the world stood in awe of his commands. Too highly elevated to realize dependence, save on his own puny arm, and inflated with ambition and supercilious pride, his soul forsook the Almighty, and attributed his greatness and dominion to his own wisdom and prudent management. Advancing in his ambitious career, regardless of the rights and happiness of others, he became the most odious and detestable of tyrants. The Almighty visited him with his chastening rod, and reduced him to a state of debasement and degradation. This judgment served to humble and reform the flagrant transgressor, and to make him acknowledge Jehovah his Sovereign Lord. A continued state of prosperity and glory would only have served to sink him deeper and deeper in guilt, and to drive him further and further from righteousness and God. Now as sore chastisements were the best means which infinite wisdom could devise, for converting him from the error of his ways, who could have prayed that these afflictive dispensations should have been withheld, that he might have been left to his own destruction, wantonly rioting on the bounteous gifts of Heaven? “Spare the rod and spoil the child.”

The children of Israel were abundantly blessed with all temporal and spiritual blessings after their emancipation from Egyptian vassalage and settlement in Palestine—the land of promise flowing with milk and honey. By the special favor of Jehovah, they were exalted to the highest dignity of national prosperity, and to the loftiest eminence of glory and achievement. But notwithstanding his peculiar regard for them, and the numberless exhibitions of his matchless power, and tokens of sovereign mercy and guardian care, their hearts revolted from their Maker, and they turned to idolatry and wickedness. They became insolent, self-conceited, and arrogant; and in order to subject them to the righteous government of God, it became necessary to humble them by oppression and servitude. Accordingly, under the providence of God, they were reduced to a state of captivity under the Assyrian yoke, where they remained in abject slavery seventy years. Here in their adversity they were led to acknowledge the God of their fathers, and to cry mightily to him for favor, knowing he only could deliver them from the afflictive evils they were each led to endure. They turned their longing, wishing eyes, to the land of their nativity, and deeply sighed for a return to the sepulchres of departed friends, the pleasures of temple worship, and the privileges of the sanctuary services. It was during their captivity under the Assyrian Monarch, that the prophet uttered the petition standing at the head of this article. It is worthy of remark, he does not pray that God would do differently to his enemies, than he had done to him, for his offences. The Assyrians at that time had become powerful and idolatrous, wicked and debased, and it seems to have been the earnest desire of the servant of the Most High, “that all their wickedness might come before the God of Hosts,” pleading for vengeance, that he might punish them in such a manner as would render them subservient to God’s holy law. And inasmuch as God will by no means clear the guilty, as he will reward every man according as his work shall be; so, seeing righteousness tendeth to life, and vice to misery and death; seeing a suitable punishment for sin is just sufficient to restore the transgressor to holiness and conscious rectitude, it is not unworthy of the name of a Christian, to even pray that the guilty might not go unpunished; that God would reward them according to their sins, and the iniquities wherewith they have transgressed against him: Hence the apostle Paul is heard to say relative to the coppersmith who had done him much evil, “the Lord reward him according to his works,” and David also prays that his sentence might come from the presence of the Lord. “No chastisement for the present seemeth joyous, nevertheless afterward, it produceth the peaceable fruits of righteousness, to them that are exercised thereby.”

L. L. S.

FROM THE RELIGIOUS INQUIRER.

CONTENTMENT.

“For I have learned in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content.”—PAUL.

The greatest lesson that a man can learn is to be contented with his lot in life. “I am in the station which God has assigned me,” said Epictetus. A thorough conviction of such a truth will tend to make us satisfied with human life. Repining can be of no service to ourselves nor to society. We do not mean that kind of indolent contentment which makes us satisfied under any circumstances; for it is no fault to strive to better our condition, “God hath given to man an active mind, which is ever climbing to more perfection. Perfection is set in the heights, and though man cannot reach it, yet should he ever draw nearer to it, by industriously persevering in the rising way.”

A variety of reasons may be urged why we

should be contented. We should look back and see how wonderfully we have been preserved through past life; we should consider how many dangers we have been carried through. How often has it happened when all was dark around us, that light has suddenly and unexpectedly burst forth in our path from a quarter that we did not expect. 'All these things are against me,' said the patriarch when he supposed his son Joseph was destroyed by wild beasts; but Providence was then preparing for him and thousands more a great blessing. We should consider the extent of the divine promises. God has not only given us an existence here, but has promised to bless us forever. 'He is not a man that he should lie, nor the son of man that he should repent.' He is unchangeable. He will protect and provide for all things that he has made. Look abroad, O discontented man! See the beautiful works of God. Behold every where evidences of his wisdom and goodness. Behold him wheeling silently and gloriously the mighty orbs that roll in the immensity of space. All the power that is there exerted is but the means that a Father has at his disposal to bless his creatures. Why should ye repine then, O man! Could the Lord of heaven and earth have done more for your comfort? He has introduced you into a beautiful world. He has surrounded you with evidences of his kindness. While he controls the most distant planet he forgets not the wants of the minutest insect. Learn then, to be content. Heaven requires it. Reason demands it. Are you in adversity? 'The Lord will not cast off forever, but though he cause grief yet will he have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies, for he does not afflict willingly nor grieve the children of men.' Are you in prosperity? Forget not the source from whence cometh all thy blessings. Remember that 'in God you live, move and have your beings.' Give thanks unto him and bless his name. Acquaint thyself with him and be at peace; thereby good shall come unto thee. Let us all endeavor to obtain that state of mind in which we can say, whatever may befall us; 'We have learned in whatsoever state we are in, therewith to be content.'

PRAYER.

"I will therefore, that men pray every where, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting." 1. Tim. 2, 3.

Prayer is an important and interesting duty; and should always be performed with holy reverence, and humble confidence towards God; and in a spirit of charity and good will towards our fellow men. These are both implied in this Apostolic direction. In relation to God, we should pray with humble, filial confidence, believing that if our petitions are agreeable to his will, they will at least in substance, be granted. If we pray for ourselves, that God "will never leave us nor forsake us;" that we may not be "tempted above that we are able;" "that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need;" and that God will be the strength of our heart, and our portion forever." In the use of such petitions, we may, as the Apostle directs, "come boldly to the throne of grace," and we may lift up holy hands without doubting.

If we pray for our brethren and fellow creatures, even for all men, as directed in the beginning of this chapter. This, also, we are assured is "good and acceptable in the sight of our Savior;" and in praying for the salvation of all men, there should be, and there need be no doubting; for the Apostle declares God "will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." And in view of this will, and determination of God concerning the salvation of all men, proceeding from his infinite and impartial benevolence, surely we may well be excited to pray, and lift up holy hands, without wrath also;

without any feelings of enmity, or ill will; in a spirit of forgiveness, tenderness, and universal kindness and charity. A question occurs: How can persons pray in the true spirit of charity, which "hopeth all things," without hoping for the salvation of all men; or how can they pray for the salvation of all men without doubting, when they have no faith that God intends to save, or that he ever will save all men; but will punish a large portion of them to all eternity.

To preach that God will not save all men, and to pray to God for the salvation of all men, appears to us like a contradiction. Reader, how does it appear to thee?—*Christian Pilot.*

MEDICAL DESERTERS.

Mr. Editor—It is at best an unpleasant task to assail the conduct or expose the delinquencies of our fellow men. It is much more congenial to the feelings of the philanthropist, to dwell upon the virtues and portray the beauties and excellencies of mankind, than either to deride their infirmities or enumerate their faults. We regard that, however, as a peevish, nay, a sickly sympathy, which suffers the guilty to go unrebuked and unscathed. So long, therefore, as we believe in the verity of the maxim, that "he who spares the guilty hurts the good," we shall, as in duty bound, expose and chastise the "selfish and unfaithful."

We would gladly withhold the rod on the present occasion, did not justice demand its infliction. Let not those physicians, then, who fled the city whilst the late destroyer was banqueting upon the lives of its inhabitants, complain, if we should deal out so much chastisement as, in our opinion, will deter them from committing a similar offence.

Ere we proceed, however, to animadvert upon their conduct, we would remark, and we wish the remark to be borne in mind, that we have nothing selfish in view—no feelings of revenge to satiate—no private interests to advance—no personal wrongs to redress—no animosities to gratify; and that we are actuated by no other motives, feelings or considerations under heaven, than a becoming regard for justice and the public welfare.

It would be unnecessary to dwell upon the disastrous consequences which the flight and absence of our citizens has had upon us as a community. We are all but too conscious that it will require many years to regain the ground already lost—confidence has been prostrated—the energies of our merchants paralyzed, and the laboring classes, in many instances, driven to pauperism and despair; whilst thousands of the absentees have sustained great inconveniences as well as pecuniary embarrassments—and that the flight of a large portion of them was caused by the advice and example of the medical deserters, will not be denied. How different would have been the result had these physicians remained at their posts, and instead of exciting the fears of their acquaintances and the public by their own unmanly example and pitiful pusillanimity, encouraged them to have remained, and advised them of the means (as far as practicable) calculated to avert and baffle the epidemic. The truth of the above position is sufficiently illustrated in the course of conduct observed by the citizens of Philadelphia and Baltimore; notwithstanding the disease has raged in both those places to a considerable extent, yet we find that the inhabitants generally remained at home, (as advised by the faculty,) and business continued to flow on in its usual channels without scarcely any impediment or interruption.

When we consider that fear and distrust are among the most prominent of the exciting causes, we must necessarily conclude that the mortality in our city has been greater, notwithstanding thousands sought refuge (as they supposed) in flight, than it would have been, had they re-

mained here, and been properly counselled by their medical advisers. Almost every family has its favorite physician, in whom they place more or less confidence, and who they very properly suppose to possess a much more accurate knowledge of their temperaments, constitutions and habits than could be immediately acquired by the most skilful practitioner; consequently, a want of confidence in a strange physician, together with the alarm which a knowledge of the flight of their usual attendant would inevitably produce, has led to the most unhappy results in numerous instances. A large number of physicians have also fallen victims to the epidemic and it is a melancholy fact, that in almost every instance, the disease was superinduced by fatigue and exhaustion; whereas, had all the physicians remained, and acted with becoming diligence, the labor would have been lessened, and this great mortality among the faculty averted. Such, then, are a few of the evils which the ill advised flight of a number of our physicians have produced, and for which a discerning public will hold them responsible.

Shall we be told that the circumstances under which these physicians left were sufficient to justify them in so doing? If they can with truth affirm that sickness and consequent inability to attend to their duties, was the cause of their migration, we say the plea is sufficient, and their acquaintances, as well as the public, will most readily acquit them; but that plea, and that only, will be considered as valid and satisfactory. All those, therefore, who cannot plead indisposition as an excuse, ought and will be regarded as moral delinquents, utterly unworthy of confidence, and meriting that retribution which an indignant public will righteously and faithfully inflict.

We ask, whether he should be regarded as a friend, who, after having partaken of our prosperity and profited by our patronage, should desert us when the "storm came on," forsake us in our exigencies, or leave us to our fate when perils beset our path? We believe that the most credulous and forgiving would be unwilling to confide in the friendship of such an one a second time. What pretensions, then, we ask, have those physicians to our confidence or patronage, who basely deserted us in the hour of trial? who recklessly and ignominiously fled from that field where humanity, honor, and duty called? We would regard that man as a friend and benefactor who deserted us in the hour of adversity merely, when compared to him who would forsake us when disease and death encompassed us about; especially when it was his business and bounden duty to watch over us, and to guard as a faithful sentinel the portals of life.

Shall we be told that the physicians had a right in common with other citizens to leave the city in the hour of danger? We reply, that they were under every moral obligation to remain at their posts, that the soldier is, who has enlisted in the cause of his country, to face the foe when duty requires; and he who would desert at the first demonstration of the enemy, must be regarded as cowardly and unfaithful.

If those medical gentlemen should urge their fears as a plea in extenuation of their conduct, we can only say, that they are unfit for the calling they have chosen, and will, therefore, as honest men, abandon a profession for which the God of nature has never designed nor qualified them, and leave the field to those who have proved themselves to be both faithful and competent.

We are willing to believe that the flight of several of the medical gentlemen has been a blessing to the city, and for ought we know, they might have fled in mercy to the inhabitants; that is, "left the city for the city's good." This, at all events, must be considered as a charitable view of the subject—and

"This joy to speak the best we may of human kind."
—N. Y. Daily Sentinel. A CITIZEN.

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

EDITED BY T. J. SAWYER AND P. PRICE.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1832.

The usual order of exercises at the Orchard-st. Church is resumed. The morning service commences at half past ten, the afternoon at three, and the evening at 7 o'clock. The course of Sabbath evening Lectures, on the doctrines of Universalism, proposed to be delivered in this Church, will be postponed for a few weeks. Due notice will be given of their commencement.

We have made arrangements by which we shall be enabled to bind the present volume of the Messenger for such of our subscribers as may wish it. It will be well for them to collect and arrange them now as speedily as possible, that they may hand them in immediately after the close of the volume. The work will be done in the best manner. The price will depend in some degree on the quantity, and the state in which the numbers may be; not, however, to exceed *fifty cents*, for good *half-binding*. They will write their names, street and number, on the margin, and the Nos. that may be missing, and as far as possible we shall complete the sets. P.

THE SECOND VOLUME.

We think it probable, from letters received, we may have been misunderstood by some, in our request for returns on the second volume of the Messenger. The terms of the second volume, it is true, are \$2, *in advance*, but we do not require the money, by any means, *until the volume has commenced*. We were anxious to have returns, of the number of subscribers only, as generally as possible before the close of the first volume, that we might know with what degree of security we might pledge another volume. And we would still respectfully solicit the attention of agents and subscribers, who have not communicated with us, to the subject. An effort on the part of each to get us one or two additional names would result in giving us a list that would enable us to go on our way with confidence and security. We have endeavored to labor faithfully for the last year, although it has been to a pecuniary loss, and we look with confidence to the future, with the exertion of our friends, for a remuneration. We have believed a paper could be sustained here. We are more and more convinced of this. And the returns which are coming in for the second volume give us strong hope that our exertions have been approved of, and that we shall be supported in our future efforts. P.

NORTH-SALEM, N. Y.

We last week noticed the Dedication of a new Meeting House, recently erected by the Universalist Society in North Salem, with a brief allusion to the general progress of our cause in that section. A few additional particulars in regard to the formation of the society, its officers, &c. may not be uninteresting—to the friends adjacent, at least.

The Society was organized the 17th of last January, and consisted of about 25 male members, though the congregation may be estimated at from 250 to 300. *Samuel Hunt, Thomas Smith, William Howe, senr. Levi Smith, Epene-*

tus Howe, and Henry Hunt, were chosen Trustees—*Jesse Smith*, Treasurer, and *Hezekiah Scott*, Secretary. With most of the above named persons we have the pleasure of a personal acquaintance, and we need not say to them, we enjoy great gratification in recording them as above. Under their guidance and direction and the influence of their moral walk and conduct, we have a firm and unshaken conviction that the Society *must* prosper; and we cannot but congratulate our friends generally in this place, on the success which has attended their first concerted efforts in the cause of Liberal Christianity, and upon the prospects which are now opening before them as a Society. Within the space of eight months, from their first organization, they have completed a neat and commodious house of worship, and have had the gratification, of seeing a respectable congregation grow up—for numbers, particularly, we believe not equalled by any denomination in the place.

We must attribute much of this rapid success to the course adopted by the friends in this place, in *not* "forsaking the assembling themselves together" on the Sabbath, whether they had a ministering brother with them or not. For a considerable length of time past, (we know not how long,) they have been in the practice of assembling together every Sabbath, for reading and social worship. Our worthy Br. Scott, we believe, has usually officiated. The result is before us; and it speaks the language to our friends in other places—"Go and do likewise."

One clause in their constitution we admire. It exhibits a feeling towards other denominations, which should ever be fostered by us; and we hope, for the credit of our order, the spirit of it may ever be a standing regulation in the erection of all houses of worship. For we regard our opposers Brethren, how much soever they may abuse or ill-treat us, and we confidently believe the period will arrive, "in the dispensation of the fulness of times," when the prejudice and gross darkness in which they are now enshrouded, will pass off, as the mists of the morning, leaving them to a "bright and cloudless day"—when they shall "see as they are seen, and know even as they are known," and "God become all in all." If they shut their houses against us, we should never do the same to them, but ever be willing to bear their arguments, and weigh them candidly. The following is the clause to which we allude. P.

"This House shall be for the use and benefit of the above-named Society, [*The First Universalist Society of North Salem and its vicinity*], and when not occupied by them, it shall be free for any other denomination of people, professing christianity, to worship in; and there shall be a keeper of the keys in the neighborhood of the said House, who shall be authorized by the Trustees to either open the house, or authorize it to be opened, at the request of any other denomination, for public worship, when not occupied or to be occupied by the above-named Society."

Br. L. F. W. Andrews is now on his way South, with the view of spending the fall and winter seasons within the States of Georgia and South Carolina. We cheerfully recommend him to the kind attentions of our friends in that section. Letters and papers for him, should be directed to Augusta, Ga.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.
THE LORD'S SUPPER.

I am pleased to perceive that the article on the Lord's Supper, published in the 41st No. of the Messenger, elicited some remarks from Br. Sawyer, in No 44. I unite with him in desiring a full discussion of the subject by Universalists—believing it will be profitable to our denomination. And a principal object designed by the article referred to, was, to induce some one, more competent than myself, to investigate the matter. I rejoice that one so well qualified as Br. S. to do justice to the subject, has undertaken to prove the intended perpetuity of the rite in discussion.

S. acknowledges his "attachment to the institution under consideration," and frankly allows the probability that his opinions in relation thereto "are somewhat influenced by prejudice." It is equally probable that I am prejudiced against all rites and ceremonies. I do not regard the Eucharist as "an ordinance established by our divine Master," nor do I believe that it "comports with the nature and design of his religion." Instead of the simplicity that so pre-eminently endears the Gospel to my heart, I see much ostentation in the most humble administration of what is termed the Lord's Supper, at the present day. Forms and ceremonies were not regarded by the Master, except so far as he deemed it expedient to conform to Jewish customs. He submitted to outward baptism—not intending thereby to establish the rite as a christian ordinance, but simply because he deemed it expedient for the time being. He did not open his lips to speak of *formal* prayer, until urged to do so by his disciples; nor do I find that in any instance he enjoined the observance of any form or ceremony as a christian ordinance. His religion is summed up in one word—*love*. It is wholly a religion of the heart. The design of it is to win the soul from outward things, and bring the feelings into stillness before God.

I have no doubt that participation in what is termed the Lord's Supper, has sometimes, perhaps frequently, been productive of advantage to the believer. But may not the love of the Lord have been as vividly brought to remembrance, without the use of the outward elements? I believe I as sincerely reverence his virtues, as ardently love him, feel as devotedly attached to the Gospel, and am as truly grateful for what the Savior effected, as any man can be. Yet I have never partaken of the outward communion. I do not suppose that any christian finds it necessary to partake of 'the meat that perisheth,' to perpetuate the remembrance of the love of our Lord. I rejoice in believing that Universalists especially, so fully realize their obligations to the Savior, as to love him devoutly, whether they do or do not join in the celebration of the outward rite. Nevertheless, "let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind."

I do not suppose "that the Eucharist possesses any secret charm, or that it was intended to exert any mystical influence." I have not intentionally intimated any thing to this effect, nor do I believe my language will bear such construction. I view the lamb slain in the Jewish passover as typical of the Lamb of God—of his body and blood, that is, of his religion and doctrine. And I consider the Jewish Passover, as a whole, to be emblematical of the Christian Communion, the Supper of the Lamb in the soul, the provisions of the table being "the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." 1 Cor. v, 7, 8.

If it be allowed that the "outward (Jewish) Baptism was typical of the 'washing of regeneration,'" why should it not be allowed that "the outward (Jewish) Passover represented the supper of the Lamb in the soul?" When I speak of the *emblems* of this supper, I speak of

the Jewish Passover—and not of the elements in which S. now beholds simply a remembrance of the Lord.

Br. S. cannot fully agree with me, when I say, "I know of no evidence that the last supper, so called, was any thing more than the celebration by Jesus and his disciples, of the Jewish Passover." He thinks "it was something more; that our Lord gave to the broken bread and the cup a new and more affecting import than they possessed in the Passover." I grant, and maintain, that Jesus opened the minds of his disciples to perceive in the passover a type they had not before perceived—and it may be said that in so doing he gave "a new and more affecting import" to the Passover—but it does not necessarily follow that the thing to which the "new and more affecting import" was given, was in any sense changed, or that it became "something more," than it had previously been.

S. says, that "the Lord's Supper, [by which he means something distinct from the Jewish rite,] was instituted at the feast of the Passover." This has not yet been shown to my satisfaction. I am still decidedly of opinion that the last supper was neither more nor less than the Jewish Passover, celebrated with the understanding that it pointed to the mediator. The rite had previously been observed as a memorial of events connected with the deliverance of the Jews from Egypt—but then, for the first time, it was understood to have farther reference. In these remarks, my reply is found to the opinion of S. that "the Lord selected a part of the Passover service, and converted it into a rite."

As Br. S. has not cited any thing in support of his argument, from Matthew or Mark, I shall briefly notice all that is said by Luke, concerning the last supper.

Jesus sent Peter and John to prepare the Passover. "They made ready the passover," and Jesus and the twelve sat down. Jesus said unto them, "With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer: For I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves; for I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom shall come. And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you." Luke xxii, 7—20.

From this testimony we learn, 1st. That Jesus and his disciples were celebrating the Jewish Passover. His disciples, as well as himself were Jews—and as such (prejudiced as they were in favor of Jewish institutions, and not fully aware of the nature of the Messiah's kingdom) would not have understood that the last supper was any thing more than the annual Passover, without an express assurance that it was something more—which assurance was not given. The most that will be pretended is, that it was implied—but would not the nature of the case require it to be explicitly expressed?

2d. We learn from the cited testimony, that the Jewish Passover, when celebrated by Jesus and his disciples, was not yet fulfilled in the kingdom of God—that the kingdom was not yet come. Consequently, the Passover was still to be observed. But Jesus, foreseeing his approaching death, assured his disciples (though the passage is rather ambiguous,) that he would not again partake of the Passover. [Wakefield.] Does not this plainly imply that his disciples should (or would) again observe the Jewish rite?

3d. We farther learn that the Jewish Passover would be fulfilled in the kingdom of God when it should come—that is, when the Gospel should

be fully established, and of course not before. When the old dispensation was entirely abrogated, viz. in the destruction of the Jewish temple and polity, then all the types of the shadowy covenant were fulfilled in the kingdom of God—but not before. And I think this remark properly reaches the case of the Jewish Passover.

4th. Let us notice, that after saying, "With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you," Jesus immediately "took the cup," and "brake the bread," and gave to his disciples. Is it not plain, that Jesus considered this a part of, and belonging to, the Jewish rite, and to that alone?

And here I observe that, in saying, "This do in remembrance of me," I understand the Savior to mean, that whenever his disciples observed the Jewish Passover, they should remember that it was a type of him, as well as a memorial of events in Egypt—and that the object of it, as a type, would be accomplished when the kingdom of God should be fully established in room of the Levitical covenant.

And I think this view of the subject receives strong confirmation from 1 Cor. xi, "This cup is [represents] the new testament in my blood [doctrine;] this do ye as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me. For as oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come"—that is, "till it [the Jewish Passover] be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." Luke xxii, 16.

When I said that "no argument for the perpetuity of the outward rite can be drawn from the instructions of the Savior," I advanced what I thought was so obviously true, as to admit of no denial. Jesus said to his disciples, "Take, eat;" Matt. xxvi, 26. Mark xiv, 22. Br. S. does not cite this language. It was addressed to the twelve; and I cannot perceive how a command so evidently limited to those to whom it was immediately addressed, could be seriously urged as an argument for the perpetuity of the rite.

The chief dependance is placed on Luke xxii, 19. "This do in remembrance of me." But I know of no sufficient reason why this language should be supposed to furnish a stronger argument, or to imply more, than, "Take, eat."

It is true, in saying, "Take, eat," "This do in remembrance of me," no limitation is expressed, neither is the perpetuity expressed, nor do I believe it is implied. Were it a moral precept, by which I mean a rule of life, I should not ask for positive evidence of its intended perpetuity. But as this discussion concerns simply an outward rite, I cannot feel free to allow inferential proof, unless it be of the most decisive character. I am opposed to all rites and ceremonies, except so far as I find them expressly enjoined, or so far as their undoubted utility may be an argument for their observance.

S. inquires concerning the rite in discussion, "Had it been designed as temporary, would not the nature of the case have required that its limitation should have been expressed?" I reply, by altering the form of the question. Had it been designed as perpetual, would not the nature of the case have required that its perpetuity should have been expressed?

I do not think an argument in favor of the perpetuity of the Lord's Supper, so called, can fairly be drawn from "the visible relation it bears to the Passover"—for, beside that I view the Passover as itself the outward rite, the disciples well knew that, though a perpetual memorial, it was to be fulfilled in the kingdom of God; in other words, abolished when the temple was destroyed.

S. says, "the ordinance was instituted; the disciples were commanded to observe it. [The question, *What?* still remains undecided.] But because it was not said, *this do forever*, are we left to conclude that the rite was only temporary?"

In reply, I remark, that Jesus commanded the

multitude and his disciples to do whatsoever they were bidden by the scribes and pharisees. Matt. xxiii.

But because it was not said, this is a temporary command, are we left to conclude that it was perpetually binding? If it be said, it was binding so long as the scribes and pharisees sat in Moses' seat, I add, that the same remark will apply to the Jewish Passover.

No doubt we are equally interested with the primitive disciples in the instructions, the promises, the death and love of our common Lord." But I do not believe that "the rite is now as necessary as (it was) in the days of the apostles." We are differently situated in many respects. Circumstances were then in being, and events about to transpire, with which we have little or no concern, save as matters of history and admonition. Moreover, as the Passover was not then fulfilled in the kingdom of God, they were bound to observe it, till the Lord came—remembering that, as a type, it pointed to the mediator of a better covenant, and to the operations of his spirit.

I may here notice a particular which, I think, deserves some attention, from those who advocate the perpetuity of the rite under consideration. John, who, it is generally allowed, wrote especially for the use of the Gentiles, records nothing about the last supper. According to Lardner, he wrote his history A. D. 68. The 1st Epistle to the Corinthians was written about A. D. 56. John was one of the twain who were sent to prepare the Passover. He was perhaps more intimately acquainted with Jesus, with his views, and with the nature and object of his religion, than were the rest of the apostles. If John had believed the observance of the Eucharist was of perpetual obligation, he surely would not have neglected to notice the institution of the rite—if a rite differing in aught from the passover was instituted by the Master.

I now pass to notice what Br. S. has said on 1 Cor. xi. He allows that the coming of the Lord spoken of in verse 26, refers to the coming at the destruction of Jerusalem. With a little alteration I can adopt his paraphrase of that verse and its connexion—though I wholly disallow the use of the words "christian ordinance," in relation to the rite in discussion. In celebrating that rite as Jesus did the passover—that is, without discerning in it a father reference than to events connected with the deliverance from Egypt—"the mongrel Christians at Corinth [Clarke] disregarded the injunction of the Master." "This do in remembrance of me." "Not discerning the Lord's body," they partook unworthily of the bread and the wine. "For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep." But when the Lord came, as predicted, the obligation to observe the rite ceased by limitation—for then the Passover was fulfilled in the kingdom of God. For the emphatic direction, "till the Lord come," does, in my apprehension, limit the obligation to observe the rite to the period to which it refers, viz. the destruction of the temple.

But S. says:—"If 1 Cor. xi, 26, is proof sufficient to satisfy us that the Eucharist was not to be celebrated after the coming of the Lord, Matt. xxviii, 20, is as good proof that the public ministry of the Gospel was not to survive the same event. 'For, lo, I am with you even unto the end of the world,' [the subversion of the Jewish state and religion.] If the former expresses a limitation of one, the latter may of the other."

I beg leave to dissent from the conclusion here drawn. Jesus is now present with every believing soul—but not in the same sense in which he was with believers until the abolishment of the old covenant and the establishment of the new. Then, believers cast out devils in the name of Jesus, they spake with new tongues, they took up serpents, &c. Mark xvi, 17, 18. These

signs do not *now* "follow them that believe"—nor is it necessary that they should. The claims of Jesus to the character he assumed were established by miracles—but the necessity for these evidences was entirely superseded by the literal fulfilment, in the destruction of Jerusalem and the attendant circumstances, of his repeated predictions. Our Savior, until the end of the age, was with his disciples in an especial sense—and through his grace, they were enabled to furnish palpable tokens of the divinity of his mission, in presenting the visible proofs that they were his followers. But because the age of miracles ceased at the period of the subversion of the Jewish state, it does not follow that the Gospel was no longer to be publicly proclaimed. No limitation can be found in connexion with the commands of Christ touching the promulgation of the word of truth. Nor will the nature or object of the Gospel allow of limitation.

But in relation to the rite in discussion, the case is very different, as, I think, has been already shown. It was, in my estimation, a Jewish ordinance, which, at the last supper and until the second coming of the Lord, was to be celebrated, with the understanding that it had a farther reference, than simply to events prominently interwoven with the Jewish history. In other words, that the disciples were to celebrate it, remembering that it pointed to the Redeemer of the world, and was soon to be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.

I close this article, with remarking, that I make no pretensions to infallibility. It is probable I have made some mistakes in what I have already written on this subject. I shall be thankful to him who shall set me right, if I am in an error. I have endeavored to explain my own views as plainly as I could, and to examine the views of others with a sincere desire to "come to the knowledge of the truth."

Philadelphia.

A. C. T.

N. B. I have noticed some friendly remarks on the discussion in progress, by a highly esteemed brother in the ministry, and would respectfully suggest to him, that, in his comments on my former article, the argument, in my opinion, was too much curtailed to present its proper bearing. The subject is an important one, and though my side of the question may not be so well sustained as it is susceptible of being, it is desirable that *if any*, the *principal* arguments should be extracted, condensed, if not in *extenso*.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

TEST OF FELLOWSHIP.

Messrs. EDITORS—In reading the proceedings of the Hudson River Association, as given us in the last Messenger, I was somewhat surprised to discover a Resolution on the subject of the literary qualifications of candidates for the fellowship of that body. Our views of the subject may be singular, but with due deference to the opinions of the respected Brethren who sat in that council, we cannot help supposing that the operations of the Resolution in question will be injurious to the cause it was intended to advance, instead of the contrary.

It is well known to us all, that we owe nearly all our success in the spread of the benign principles of our holy faith, under God, to the active labors of ministers who have been always extremely deficient in literary attainments. At the present time, many of our most popular and useful preachers have no pretensions of that sort, and are in fact unable to write a sermon correctly; that is, without gross violation of the most common principles of Rhetoric and English Grammar. But yet our brethren of the Hudson River Association, we are sure, would not dis-fellowship such men for their deficiency in those qualifications. Why then refuse fellowship to others in like circumstances? Will it not also prevent many young men from entering the mi-

nistry, if it is required of them to spend a certain period in study, and pass through a routine of examinations before admission into the fellowship of the order? We think it will, as we know there are many who are deterred from the work, solely because of their inability to detach themselves from their ordinary callings long enough to qualify themselves as fully as they themselves wish. They are poor, and cannot expect assistance from the Education Societies of the land for the preparation of pious young men for the ministry; and if there are any obstacles thrown in the way of such, they will probably abandon their intentions entirely. This we fear will be the result, and our cause will thus be deprived of some efficient and talented advocates. The very cause assigned for the adoption of the Resolution is one we should urge against it. We have understood that the increasing importance of our order in the estimation of the public was urged as a reason why we should begin to look up a little as to ministerial qualifications, in order that we might rank in this respect with any other sect of Christians. Now it does appear to us that if we have grown to such a respectable standing in point of numbers and character, without the aid of test laws and restrictive measures, that there is not the least occasion for such guards to the ministerial office, at this juncture. What has happened once, may happen again, and we doubtless will *continue* to increase in importance under the old system of things, as we have hitherto done, which may be at least questionable under the proposed change of measures. For one, the writer of this has no objections whatever to our minister's being *learned* men in every sense of the word. This is a highly important addition to their capacity for usefulness, but we would not have any deterred from embarking in the ministry, because their influence might not be so great as that of their brethren who are more learned than themselves.

That part of the resolution under consideration which requires an "essay on some moral or doctrinal subject," we do not probably fully understand. If it is designed to make the candidate for fellowship conform his sentiments in regard to Gospel Truth to the opinions of the examining committee in every respect, we should have stronger objections to it, than to that part of the resolution touching literary acquirements. We have heretofore acknowledged no *creed* save a belief in one Supreme Being—of the truth of revelation, and the final happiness of all our race; and that has been found sufficient. Let it not therefore be said that we are following after the pernicious custom of other denominations—in setting ourselves up as judges of the fitness or unfitness of those who desire to "preach the word," and requiring them to square their faith in accordance with our views, instead of the scriptures of truth. Such may not be the spirit of the resolution in question, but it certainly has that appearance. Will some one of our worthy brethren who were present at the meeting of the Hudson River Association, give us some explanation of the reasons which governed them in the adoption of their restrictive regulation? By so doing he will confer a favor on more than one friend to the prosperity of Universalism.

CLERICUS.

New-York, Oct. 1st. 1832.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

Messrs. EDITORS—Dr. Adam Clarke in his sermon from these words, "What must I do to be saved," abundantly ridicules the idea of those who believe that punishment in another world is designed for the reformation, and consequent salvation of the sufferer, and seems to exult in his new discovered logical conclusion—that the thing is absurd, because it would make the effect destroy the cause. His arguments are that all suffering, or punishments are the effects of

sin, and if they are made the means of reformation from sin, then the *effect* is the means of destroying the *cause*, which he says is absurd. He frequently repeats the same idea in his commentaries. Hence he virtually asserts that none can get to heaven but those who attain to sinless perfection in this life, otherwise death which is the effect of sin, would destroy its cause.

Not to insist how directly contrary to the whole tenor of scripture, and to common sense, his logical conclusions are, we would simply ask the learned Doctor, or any of his admirers, to answer the following plain question,

Was not the death of Christ the effect of sin?

We request an answer.

Southold, Sept. 2.

"MEDICAL DESERTERS."

In another part of our paper of to-day, will be found an article under the above caption. Although its subject matter does not come exactly within the general scope of our Paper, we give place to it for two reasons—the earnest solicitation of several of our readers, and because we think it a subject which should be brought home to the consideration of every member of community. The writer of the article has done that justice to the subject, which leaves little occasion for additional observations. We cannot, for ourselves, put aside the belief, that if our citizens, generally, had remained at their posts, the sickness among us would not have been enhanced, even if it had been as great. The consequences to our city may easily be perceived. And that our medical advisers had it in their power to exert an important influence in retaining them, few will dispute. The question then, is simply this, what was their duty? In the sentiment of a "A Citizen," we should say, that soldier was little deserving of the confidence of his country, who after enjoying her bounties through times of *peace*, should desert her on the first appearance of danger. We want not physicians, unless we can have them while dangerous sickness is in our midst.

P.

* * We gratefully acknowledge the receipt of an article, for the Messenger, "On the *Mystery of Christianity*," by Br. O. A. Skinner, of the "Pioneer and Visitor," Baltimore. He will accept our thanks for his favor, which shall have an early insertion.

RELIGIOUS NOTICES.

Br. J. M. Austin, of Troy, N. Y. will preach in North Salem, N. Y. on the first Sunday in October; in Long Ridge, Conn. on the second Sunday of October, and in Somers, N. Y. on the third Sunday in October.

Br. Wm. Whittaker, senior, recently from England, will preach at Norwalk, Ct. Sunday, 7th of October; at Saugatuck, on Tuesday evening the 9th, at Bethel, Friday evening, 12th; at Danbury Sunday the 14th, and at Newtown, Sunday the 21st. The brethren at Danbury and Newtown can make such arrangements as may be convenient, for two evening lectures, between the 14th and 21st.

Br. S. J. Hillyer, will preach at Easton, Penn. on Sunday, the 14th October.

Br. L. F. W. Andrews, will preach at Hightstown, N. J. on the 1st Sunday of Oct.

Br. L. F. W. Andrews appoints to preach in Harrisburgh, Pa. on the 30th Sunday of October. The brethren in that place will please make the necessary arrangements and give due notice of the appointment.

LIKENESS OF MR. BALLOU.

Just received and for sale at this office, a very correct Likeness of the Rev. Hosea Ballou, of Boston, Price 50 cents.

THOU HAST MADE DESOLATE ALL MY COMPANY.---JOB.

BY MRS. SIGOURNEY.

There shone a beam within my bower,
Affection's diamond spark;
The spoiler came with fatal power:
That beam is quenched and dark.
There was a shout of childhood's joy,
A laugh of infant glee:
The earth closed o'er my glorious boy,
My nursing—Where is he?

There seemed a sound like rushing wings,
So thick my sorrows came,
A blight destroyed my precious things—
My treasures fed the flame.
An ocean of unfathomed grief
Swept o'er me with its waves;
And here all desolate I stand
Alone amid my graves.

Alone! there flows no kindred tear,
No sympathizing sigh;
The feet of curious crowds are near,
Yet every cheek is dry:
And is there nought but veiling turf,
And cold earth loosely thrown,
To shut me from those cherished forms—
My beautiful—my own?

Yet who this fearful change hath wrought?
Who thus hath laid me low?
Was it a hand with vengeance fraught?
The malice of a foe?
No! He who called my being forth
From mute unconscious clay;
He who with more than parents care
Hath led me night and day:—

Who erreth not, who changeth not,
Who woundeth but to heal,
Who darkeneth not man's earthly lot,
Save for his spirit's weal.
Therefore I bow me to his sway,
I mourn, but not repine;
And chastened, yet confiding say,
"Lord, not my will, but thine."

SYMPATHY.

"Jesus wept."—Scripture.

One peculiar and striking feature in Christianity, is displayed in the appeals which it makes to the finer feelings and tenderest sympathies of our nature. It comes to us with all that sympathetic affection which marks the conduct of the loving mother towards her afflicted offspring. Instead of reading a cold lecture of moral duties, or philosophizing on the subject, it relieves the burden at once by taking to itself the larger portion.

There are seasons in which sympathy alone can assuage the pangs of the troubled bosom. There are moments when the only relief that you can afford to the weeping mourner, is to mingle your tears with his. Go to the couch on which infant beauty is expiring, and watch that mother, who, with heaving bosom and tearful eye, sees the sweet flower, ere it has expanded into life, withering before the fell destroyer that nips it in the bud. A week, a day, perhaps an hour before, she was contemplating it with all the ardor of a mother's love; and while pillowed on her bosom and cradled in her arms, she was counting on long hours of pleasure in the society of one whom she is now called upon to leave forever in the flesh, and consign beneath the cold sod, there to lie, "a headless carcase and a nameless thing." How shall we administer consolation to this afflicted parent? Shall we point her to the partner of her sorrow—the sympathizing companion of her grief? Shall we turn her eyes to those other dear objects of her affection, who are still spared to engage her thoughts and afford subjects for her affection? This would be a reasonable course, but its application would be too early. This solemn hour must not be interrupted by any secondary thoughts; it is sacred to the departed alone. Then seek not to break

the cord which is stretched to its utmost tension; the slightest touch, instead of loosening it, may perhaps snap it asunder forever. Allow a little time to relax this high-toned feeling. Suffer the mind a season of rest to recover itself. Silence, or an according sympathy, is alone suited to this sacred hour. "Weep with those who weep." Philosophy is out of place, and if Christianity did not convey the above sentiment, it would be out place likewise.

How much is there to elicit admiration in that interesting and pathetic scene in which the benevolent author of our religion acted such a prominent part. We refer to the transaction which took place at the tomb of Lazarus. There is no passage in the history of our blessed Redeemer, more touching than that short verse which we have prefixed to this essay, "Jesus wept." Why did he weep? He well knew that he could and would restore to the afflicted sisters their departed brother; he who was their stay, their support, and their hope. Why then, this exhibition of grief? Surely it was called for by the distressing situation in which these afflicted sisters were plunged, and he wished by sympathy first to take off that keen edge which cut them to the soul. He might have philosophized forever, and still have never been able to convey to the surrounding multitude, an adequate idea of the tenderness of that heart which melted at another's woe. But when the gushing tear proclaimed a brother's feeling and a brother's love, what was the impression on the minds of the multitude? It was one that touched every heart—they exclaimed with one accord, "behold how he loved him." O if there is such a thing as a heavenly disposition in mortal man; if there is a portion of divine love residing in the bosom of man, it appears in all its lustre, when it leads him to forego all selfish considerations, and mingle his unaffected tears with the sorrowing children of mortality. —Gospel Anchor.

PRIDE.

There may be pride in any thing. The monarchs of Egypt built pyramids to perpetuate their names, and Sardanapalus claimed the honor of posterity in an inscription which told how well he ate and drank. In modern times we have some men who are proud of making good bargains, and over-reaching their neighbors in buying and selling. We have creatures in the shape of men, whose highest ambition is to appear in clothes of a particular cut—whose ideas of perfection are confined to the tying of a cravat, or the plaiting of a ruffle. But, among all the different kinds of pride, there is none more absurd than that of the bully; his ambition is of the lowest kind. The man who resorts to personal violence to sustain his character or his cause, descends from the dignity of an intellectual and moral being to the level of the lower animals. He enters on a field where he has rivals and superiors among the four footed tribes. The bear can strike a harder blow, and the jackass can beat him at kicking. Let such a man "bow to his superiors of the stall."

A GOLDEN RULE.

"Industry will make a man a purse, and frugality will find him strings for it. Neither the purse nor the strings will cost him any thing. He who has it should only draw the strings as frugality directs, and he will be sure always to find a useful penny at the bottom of it. The servants of industry are known by their livery—it is always whole and wholesome. Idleness travels very leisurely, and poverty soon overtakes him. Look at the ragged slaves of idleness, and judge which is the best Master to serve, industry or idleness." There are exceptions to all general positions. Industry will not always make a man a purse. Be he as industrious as he may, untoward circumstances sometimes arise to

impede his progress to competency. He may be subject to losses in trade which no human foresight can avert; or the persons with whom he is connected may, by their indolence, counteract all his efforts to obtain independence.

Politeness has been defined to be artificial good nature; but we may affirm, with much greater propriety, that good nature is natural politeness.

"UNIVERSALIST EXPOSITOR."

As the "UNIVERSALIST EXPOSITOR" has been finally given over, by its former company of Proprietors, (its subscription list being transferred to one of our weekly papers,) the subscribers have formed a new company with the hope of reviving the work. They will continue it under the Title of the

EXPOSITOR:

AND UNIVERSALIST REVIEW;

which will be published in the same form, and at the same periods as the Expositor heretofore has been, and on similar paper, with the same size page and type, and at the same price, though the number of its pages will be somewhat increased.

To those acquainted with the former Expositor it may be sufficient to say that we aim at following out the plan originally drawn for that work; with one addition, however, which we trust will increase its value: we mean, the department of Review. That we must maintain the character of the publication as high, at least, as its former standard, we are well aware, unless we would forfeit the patronage which our brother Editors and several of our Associations have, especially of late, extended towards it. To their continued favor we humbly commend the undertaking.

PLAN OF THE WORK.

It will consist chiefly of—

- Explanations of Scriptural Phrases and Subjects;
- Dissertations on points of Biblical Literature;
- Critical Interpretations of Texts;
- Expositions, both argumentative and historical, of Religious truth, in general;
- Reviews of such important Works as may be deemed specially interesting to Universalists;
- A general Review of the present state of our Doctrine and Denomination, in this country, and as far as practicable, in other countries.

HOSEA BALLOU, 2d.

THOS. WHITTEMORE,

WAIT & DOW,

GEORGE W. BAZIN,

CONDITIONS.

I. The EXPOSITOR AND UNIVERSALIST REVIEW will appear in Numbers of 72 octavo pages each, once in two months; i. e. on the first of November, January, March, May, July and September; making at the end of the year an octavo volume of 432 pages.

II. It will be printed on fine paper and elegant type. The Numbers as delivered to subscribers, stitched in handsome printed covers. A Title Page, Table of Contents, and Index of Subjects, at the end of the year.

III. Price \$2 per annum—payable on receipt of the second Number.

Subscriptions and Communications received (post paid) by either of the Proprietors, or at the Trumpet and Universalist Magazine Office, No. 40, Cornhill, Boston.

* * Subscriptions received at this Office.

All letters and communications relating to this paper, must be addressed "P. Price, No. 85, Bowry, New-York."

Printed by JOHN M. DASHFORTH, 3 Chatham-Square.